

**REMARKS**

After entry of this Amendment, claims 19, 21-27, 66-72 and 78-80 are presently under consideration and claims 73-77 are withdrawn. Claims 19, 22, 24, and 78 are amended and claims 81-84 are added without introduction of new matter. Claims 20, 21, 28-66, 78, and 80 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amended and new claims is self-evident or evident from the discussion below.

The drawings stand objected under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as failing to illustrate an "integration period", as previously claimed. As the term is removed from the claims under consideration, the objection is now moot.

The specification stands objected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to describe an "integration period", as previously claimed. Applicant contends that the term "integration period" is adequately described by the application to those skilled in the art. Further, as the term is removed from the claims under consideration, the objection is now moot.

Claim 22 is stands objected because of informalities. As the claim is amended in view of the examiner's comments, the objection is now moot.

Claims 19-27, 66-72, and 78-80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, in connection with the previously claimed "integration period". Applicant contends that the term "integration period" is adequately described by the application to those skilled in the art. Further, as the term is removed from the claims under consideration, the rejection is now moot.

Claims 19-27, 66-72, and 78-80 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in connection with the previously recited "wherein said integration period and said reset period occur while a row select transistor in the first pixel cell is activated". Applicant

contends that the previously recited feature is adequately understood by those skilled in the art. Further, as the limitation is removed from the claims under consideration, the objection is now moot.

Claims 19-25, 66-72, and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0051229 to Eguchi. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment.

Amended independent claim 19 is directed to a method for operating a first pixel cell of an imager, the method comprising: “accumulating charge at a photoconversion device; resetting a charge collection region with a reset transistor during a reset period; storing accumulated charge from said photoconversion device at said charge collection region via a transfer transistor; reading out said charge from said charge collection region; removing charge in said photoconversion device before said charge accumulation by applying a first voltage to a gate of another transistor coupled to said photoconversion device; and removing charge in said photoconversion device during said charge accumulation by applying a second voltage to said gate of said another transistor, said second voltage being different than said first voltage.” The remaining claims under consideration depend directly or indirectly from claim 19.

Non-limiting support for claim 19 is provided by the disclosure of Applicant’s Figures 9-11 and their corresponding descriptions at paras. 37 and 38. U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0145900. As shown in Figure 10, a photosensitive element is connected to a transistor 25, which connects the photosensitive element to a supply voltage Vdd. As described by paras. 37 and 38, the transistor 25 may operate to increase the dynamic range of the photosensitive element. The transistor 25 may also operate as a global shutter transistor or an anti-blooming transistor. Non-limiting support for amended claims is also provided by the disclosure of Applicant’s Figures 9-11 and their corresponding descriptions.

None of the references of record teach the combination of features of claim 19. For example, at the very least, none of the references of record teach a method of operating a pixel cell comprising: “removing charge in said photoconversion device before said charge accumulation by applying a first voltage to a gate of another transistor coupled to said photoconversion device; and removing charge in said photoconversion device during said charge accumulation by applying a second voltage to said gate of said another transistor, said second voltage being different than said first voltage”, as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Eguchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,500,692 to Rhodes. As Rhodes does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Eguchi, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 72 and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Eguchi in view of the Examiner’s reasoning (which is drawn from a statement of Applicant’s disclosure). As the Examiner’s reasoning does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Eguchi, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 80 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Eguchi in view of Yadid-Pecht et al. As Yadid-Pecht et al does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Eguchi, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

New claims 81-84 are added by entry of this Amendment. Non-limiting support for new claims 81-84 is evident from the above discussion of Applicant’s Figures 9-11 and their corresponding descriptions. Applicant submits that claims 81-84 are patentable at least in view of their dependency on independent base claim 19.

Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Steven T. Dickey

Registration No.: 54,066

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant